DRAFT

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PHIPPS OCEAN PARK BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT TOWN OF PALM BEACH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

JULY 2002

Prepared for:

Town of Palm Beach Palm Beach County, Florida

and

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jacksonville District







Prepared by:

Coastal Technology Corporation

and

Dial Cordy and Associates Inc.



DRAFT

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

JULY 2002

Regulatory Authorization
Clean Water Act Section 404 and
Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10

PHIPPS OCEAN PARK BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT TOWN OF PALM BEACH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

LEAD AGENCY: Jacksonville District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

COOPERATING AGENCIES: Town of Palm Beach, Florida (permit applicant), Florida Department of Environmental Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

This Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) describes the selected plan and the alternatives evaluated to provide shore protection for the shoreline surrounding Phipps Ocean Park within the Town of Palm Beach, Florida. The recommended plan is intended to: (1) mitigate the long-term erosion impacts of Lake Worth Inlet and armored coastline north of the Project area; (2) provide and maintain storm protection to upland improvements; (3) restore and maintain the beach for public recreational use; and (4) restore and maintain the beach for marine turtle nesting habitat. The plan includes placement of approximately 1.5 million cubic yards of fill over approximately 1.9 miles of beach, between DEP Monuments R-116 and R-126 and installation of 3.1 acres of hardbottom reef. Sand compatible with the existing beach will be obtained from borrow areas located approximately 3,500 feet offshore and between 1.5 and 2.6 miles south of the fill. Geotechnical analysis of the borrow area indicates that the material is suitable for the restoration of Phipps Ocean Park beach and suitable for use by nesting sea turtles and subsequent hatching success. The borrow areas have been designed with buffer zones to avoid impact to hardbottom communities in the vicinity of the borrow areas. Mitigation of hardbottom resources within the fill area is required and has been incorporated into the plan.

For more information, contact Dale Beter, SEIS Team Leader, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch, 400 North Congress Avenue, Suite 130, West Palm Beach, Florida 33401; phone (561) 686-3441 or facsimile 561-683-4941. Additional comments must be received by [date].

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jacksonville District

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

REGULATORY AUTHORIZATION COE SECTION 10 AND SECTION 404 PERMITS

PHIPPS OCEAN PARK BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT TOWN OF PALM BEACH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

<u>Project Description</u>. The Phipps Ocean Park Beach Restoration Project (Project) entails the placement of 1.5 million cubic yards of sand to restore 1.9 miles of beach within the Town of Palm Beach immediately south of Sloan's Curve, with construction of an artificial reef proposed as mitigation for unavoidable impacts to nearshore hardbottom. The fill area extends between Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Monuments R-116 and R-126.

The fill design profile includes a constructed berm width of approximately 140 to 330 feet with a dry beach width (distance to the MHW) of approximately 198 to 380 feet. The projected toe of fill extends approximately 280 to 540 feet offshore and will unavoidably impact approximately 3.1 acres of nearshore hardbottom located immediately adjacent to the shoreline. Fill is proposed to be obtained from two offshore borrow areas located approximately 3,500 offshore and between 1.5 and 2.6 miles south of the fill area. Fill will be transferred from the borrow areas to the fill area by hydraulic dredge; construction by hopper dredge will not be allowed to avoid impacts to hardbottom biological communities in the vicinity of the borrow areas.

Need or Opportunity. The Project is located on the southeast Florida coast within Palm Beach County. The proposed work is consistent with the "Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan Update - Palm Beach Island, Florida" (June 1998) and the "Coast of Florida, Erosion and Storm Effects Study - Region III, with Final Environmental Impact Statement, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District", October 1996. The Project is needed to mitigate the long-term erosion impacts of Lake Worth Inlet and the erosion impacts of the armored coastline north of the Project area, provide and maintain storm protection to upland improvements, restore and maintain the beach for public recreational use, and to restore and maintain the beach for marine turtle nesting habitat.

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has designated all of the Project area from R-116 to R-126 as an area of "critical erosion." This designation is based on (a) the

erosion attributable to the influence of Lake Worth Inlet and the adjacent armored shoreline and (b) the existing headland features surrounding the Project area.

Shoreline conditions and structures updrift of the Project area exacerbate erosion and, if action is not taken, will lead to significant future erosion of the Project area and the shoreline further south. Net longshore sand transport in the region is to the south. Construction of the Inlet and Inlet jetties interrupts the longshore flow of sand and sand starves the region south of the Inlet leading to the construction of seawalls, groins, and eventually a rock revetment constructed by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) north of Sloan's Curve in 1987. The revetment has cut-off the sand supply from the dune landward of the revetment. These conditions are expected to continue to contribute to the erosion within the Project area in the future.

The three miles of shoreline immediately north of Sloan's Curve are fronted by numerous armoring structures including rock revetments, seawalls, and groins. The existing groins north of Phipps Ocean Park deter southerly longshore transport to Phipps Ocean Park and the Project area. The Mid-Town Beach Restoration Project is located to the north of this three-mile segment; the groins and armoring have impeded the southerly migration of the Mid-Town sand. In combination with the effects of Lake Worth Inlet, armoring structures have caused a longshore transport and sediment deficit to the Project area, resulting in erosion, loss of the recreational beach, increase in the storm damage risk to upland property, and loss of sea turtle nesting habitat.

Major Findings and Conclusions. The proposed action is in the national interest and can be constructed while protecting the human environment from unacceptable impacts. Benefits of the proposed action would be to mitigate the long-term erosion impacts of the Inlet and the erosion impacts of armored coastline north of the Project area, provide and maintain storm protection to upland improvements, restore and maintain the beach for public recreational use, and to restore and maintain the beach for marine turtle nesting habitat. The primary adverse impact of concern is the potential impact to hardbottom resources, particularly to ephemeral intermittently exposed nearshore hardbottom features in the fill area. Other adverse impacts include increased turbidity and sedimentation in the vicinity of the borrow sites (including reefs in the vicinity of the borrow areas) during construction, increased sedimentation and turbidity along the nearshore environment during construction and potential impacts on hardbottom habitat for managed fish species. Measures taken to avoid, minimize, and compensate for adverse impacts include reducing the fill placement area to avoid nearshore hardbottom resources, use of buffer zones and strict construction vessel control requirements to avoid and minimize impact to hardbottom resources in the vicinity of the borrow areas, and installation of a 3.1 acre mitigation reef in water depths ranging from -5 feet to -13 feet north of the Project area. Specific mitigation measures associated with the dredging operations include no anchoring within 200 feet of the offshore hardbottom, no dredging within 400 feet to 524 feet east of the westerly limits of the offshore hardbottom, delineation of the borrow area with lighted buoys, use of a real time geo-positioning system on the dredge, diver assisted dredge anchor placement during day light hours only, monitoring of turbidity and sedimentation, use of manatee observers, and sea turtle monitoring.

Alternatives. Alternative plans evaluated in the SEIS include, (1) the "No-Action" Alternative, (2) beach nourishment and periodic renourishment in combination with groin structures, and (3) beach nourishment with periodic renourishment. Alternative sand sources considered include offshore borrow areas located approximately 3,500 feet offshore and between 1.5 and 2.6 miles south of the fill area mid-point, deepwater sand sources, upland sand sources, foreign sand sources, and sand from maintenance dredging of adjacent inlet ebb and flood shoals.

<u>Preferred Alternative</u>. The Preferred Alternative includes a combination of beach nourishment with periodic renourishment and construction of a 3.1 acre mitigation reef. The optimum plan for improvement consists of placement of 1.5 million cubic yards of sand over 1.9 miles of beach immediately south of Sloan's Curve between DEP Monuments R-116 to R-126. The optimum design profile includes a construction berm width of approximately 140 to 330 feet with a dry beach width (distance to the MHW) of approximately 190 to 380 feet. The projected toe of fill extends approximately 280 to 540 feet offshore. The preferred mitigation reef structure will best provide for the "like-kind" mitigation of the existing hardbottom impacted by the Project and accommodate species that use the impacted hardbottom.

<u>Issues Raised by the Public and Agencies</u>. In addition to the potential adverse impacts identified in the "Major Findings and Conclusions" statement above, some agencies and public commenters raised other concerns during the scoping process. Generally, the additional concerns related to the quantification of hardbottom resources in the vicinity of the Project, the functions and values of hardbottom features, potential secondary and cumulative effects of beach nourishment projects on hardbottom resources in the vicinity of the Project, impacts to essential fish habitat, potential of hardbottom in the borrow area dredge limits, and potential public safety concerns associated with the nearshore or shallow hardbottom mitigation reefs. Residents expressed concern with the extent of shoreline erosion, the threat of erosion to upland property and infrastructure, and the "No-Action" Alternative.

<u>Areas of Controversy</u>. The most significant area of controversy, as evaluated in this SEIS, concerns the functions and values of nearshore hardbottom features, the immediate and long-term impact of burying nearshore hardbottom in the fill area, and the effectiveness of the mitigation to compensate for the resource impacts of the Project.

<u>Unresolved issues</u>. At the time the preliminary draft SEIS was prepared, the extent, location, and quantity of mitigation reef necessary to offset impacts to nearshore hardbottom impacts had not been fully resolved. This issue is evaluated in Section 4.7, Hardbottom Resources.

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	III
LIST OF APPENDICES	XII
LIST OF FIGURES	XIII
LIST OF TABLES	XV
1.0 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED	1
1.1 Project Purpose and Agency Goal	1
1.2 Project Need	
1.3 Proposed Action	
1.4 Project Authority	
1.4.1 Initial Authorization	
1.4.2 Supplemental Information	7
1.5 Project Location	9
1.6 Project History	9
1.7 Related Environmental Documents	10
1.8 Decisions to be Made	11
1.9 Scoping and Issues	11
1.9.1 Issues Evaluated in Detail	12
1.9.2. Impact Measurement	12
1.9.2.1 Hardbottom and Reef Impacts	12
1.9.2.2 Nesting Sea Turtles and Impacts to Foraging Habitat	13
1.9.2.3 Impact to Public Recreational Opportunities	13
1.9.2.4 Impact on Upland Property	13
1.9.2.5 Sediment Budget Restoration	14
1.9.2.6 Impact on Public Safety	14
1.9.2.7 Other Impacts	14
1.9.3 Issues Eliminated From Detailed Analysis	14
1.10 Permits, Licenses, and Entitlements	15
2.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	17
2.1. Description of Alternatives Evaluated in Detail	17

2.1.1	Alternative 1 - "No-Action" Alternative	18
2.1.2	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	20
2.1.3	Alternative 3 - Beach Fill with Periodic Renourishment (Preferred)	21
2.1.4	Sand Source Alternatives Analysis	24
2.1.4	4.1 Offshore Borrow Areas (preferred)	24
2.1.4	4.2 Deep Water Sand Sources	26
2.1.4	4.3 Upland Sand Sources	29
2.1.4	4.4 Foreign Sand Sources	30
2.1.4	4.5 Inlet By-Pass Sand Sources	31
2.2 Issu	es and Basis for Choice	32
2.2.1	Project Alternatives	32
2.2.2	Sand Source Alternatives	32
2.3 Alte	rnatives Eliminated From Detailed Evaluation	32
2.3.1	Alternative 4 - Increased Fill Area Design (Placement of additional 343,200	
	cubic yards between R-114 to R-116):	32
2.3.2	Alternative 5 - Reduced Fill Area Design (Placement of 0.75 - 1.5 million	
	cubic yards between R-116 to R-121)	35
2.3.3	Alternative 6 - Revetment	37
2.3.4	Alternative 7 - Seawalls	37
2.3.5	Alternative 8 - Nearshore Berm	37
2.3.6	Alternative 9 - PEP Reef.	38
2.3.7	Alternative 10 - Groin Field Without Beach Nourishment	38
2.3.8	Alternative 11 - Modification of the Lake Worth Inlet Sand Transfer Plant	38
2.3.9	Alternative 12 - Dune Restoration	39
2.3.10	Alternative 13 - Navigation Project Modification or Abandonment	40
2.3.11	Alternative 14 - Beach Fill with Periodic Nourishment Stabilized by an	
	Offshore Breakwater	40
2.3.12	Alternative 15 - Beach Fill with Periodic Nourishment and Hurricane Surge	
	Protection Berm	40
2.3.13	Alternative 16 - Feeder Beach	41
2.4 Alte	rnatives Not Within Jurisdiction of the Lead Agency	41
2.4.1	Rezoning of Beach Area	41
2.4.2	Modification of Building Codes	41
2.4.3	Construction Setback Line	41
2.4.4	Construction Moratorium or No Growth Program	42
2.4.5	Evacuation Planning	42
2.4.6	Condemnation of Land and Structures	42

2.4.	7 Relocation or Retrofit of Structures	42
2.5	Comparison of Alternatives	43
2.6 N	Mitigation	46
3.0 AFI	FECTED ENVIRONMENT	47
3.1	Coastal Environment	47
3.1.	1 Tides	49
3.1.	2 Storm Surges	49
3.1.	3 Currents	50
3.1.	.4 Waves	50
3.2 E	Beach and Inlet Geomorphology	50
3.2.	1 Geomorphic Setting of Palm Beach Island	51
3.2.	2 Lake Worth Inlet Sediment Budget	52
3 2.	3 Palm Beach Island - Shoreline and Volumetric Changes	57
3.3 S	Sediment Characteristics of Borrow Area and Native Beach	73
3.3	.1 Sand Quality	73
3.3	2 Composition and Mineralogy	74
3.3	3 Color	74
3.4 E	Beach and Dune Vegetation and Wildlife	75
3.5	Threatened and Endangered Species	75
3.5.	1 Sea Turtles	75
3	3.5.1.1 Nesting Habitat	76
	3.5.1.1.1 Loggerhead Sea Turtle	76
	3.5.1.1.2 Green Sea Turtle	76
	3.5.1.1.3 Leatherback Sea Turtle	76
3	3.5.1.2 Nearshore Foraging and Offshore Habitat Utilization	76
	3.5.1.2.1 Loggerhead Sea Turtle	77
	3.5.1.2.2 Green Sea Turtle	77
	3.5.1.2.3 Leatherback Sea Turtle	77
3.5	2 West Indian Manatee	78
3.5.	3 Southeastern Beach Mouse	78
3.5.	4 Least Tern	78
3.5	.5 Northern Right Whale	79
3.6	Offshore Borrow Area Resources	79
3.7 H	Hardbottom Resources	80
3.7	1 Nearshore Hardbottom	82
3 7	2 Intermediate Hardbottom	83

3.7.3	Offshore Hardbottom	84
3.8 Bea	ach and Sand Bottom Communities	85
3.9 Ess	sential Fish Habitat	85
3.10	Coastal Barrier Resources	86
3.11 V	Water Quality	86
3.12 I	Hazardous, Toxic, And Radioactive Waste	87
3.13	Air Quality	87
3.14	Noise	87
3.15	Aesthetic Resources	87
3.16 I	Recreation Resources	88
3.17	Navigation	88
3.18	Cultural Resources	88
4.0 ENVI	RONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	89
	les, Winds, Currents and Waves	
4.1.1		
4.1.2		
4.1.3	Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	
4.2 Bea	ach and Inlet Geology and Geomorphology	
4.2.1	Alternative 1 - No-Action	
4.2.2	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	90
4.2.3	Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	90
4.3 Sec	diment Characteristics of Borrow Area and Native Beach	90
4.3.1	No-Action	90
4.3.2	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	91
4.3.3	Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	91
4.4 Bea	ach and Dune Vegetation and Wildlife	91
4.4.1	Alternative 1 - "No-Action"	
4.4.2	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	91
4.4.3	Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	92
4.5 Th	reatened and Endangered Species	92
4.5.1	Alternative 1 - "No-Action"	92
4.5.2	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	93
4.5.3	Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	93
4.6 Off	fshore Borrow Area Resources	92
4.6.1	Alternative 1 - "No-Action"	92
462	Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	9/

4.6.	3 Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	94
4.7 H	Hardbottom Resources	95
4.7.	1 Alternative 1 - "No-Action"	95
4.7.	2 Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	95
4.7.	3 Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	95
4.8 E	Essential Fish Habitat	
4.8.	1 Alternative 1 - "No-Action"	96
4.8.	2 Alternative 2 – Beach Fill with Structures	96
4.8.	3 Alternative 3 – Beach Fill (Preferred Alternative)	96
4.9	Coastal Barrier Resources	97
4.10	Water Quality	97
4.11	Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste	98
4.12	Air Quality	98
4.13	Noise	98
4.14	Aesthetic Resources	99
4.15	Recreational Resources	99
4.16	Cultural Resources	100
4.17	Health and Safety	100
4.18	Energy Requirements and Conservation	100
4.19	Natural or Depletable Resources	100
4.20	Cumulative Impacts	101
4.20	0.1 Hardbottom Summary	101
4.20	0.2 Sand Habitat Summary	103
4.20	0.3 Significance of Cumulative Affects	103
4.21	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	104
4.2	1.1 Irreversible	104
4.2	1.2 Irretrievable	104
4.22.	Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Effects	104
4.23	Local Short-Term Uses and Maintenance/Enhancement of Long-Term	
	Productivity	105
4.24	Conflicts and Controversy	105
4.25	Uncertain, Unique, or Unknown Risks	105
4.26	Precedent and Principle for Future Actions	106
4.27	Environmental Commitments	106
4.28	Compliance With Environmental Requirements	107
4.23	8.1 National Environmental Policy Act of 1958	107
4.23	8.2 Endangered Species Act	107

4.28.3 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958	108
4.28.4 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (inter alia)	108
4.28.5 Clean Water Act of 1972	108
4.28.6 Clean Air Act of 1972	108
4.28.7 Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972	109
4.28.8 Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981	109
4.28.9 Wild and Scenic River Act of 1968	109
4.28.10 Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972	109
4.28.11 Estuary Protection Act of 1968	109
4.28.12 Federal Water Project Recreation Act	109
4.28.13 Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976	110
4.28.14 Submerged Lands Act of 1953	110
4.28.15 Coastal Barrier Resources Act and Coastal Barrier Improvement	ent Act
of 1990	110
4.28.16 Rivers and Harbor Act of 1899	110
4.28.17 Anadromous Fish Conservation Act	110
4.28.18 Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Migratory Bird Conservation Act	110
4.28.19 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act	110
4.28.20 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act	111
4.28.21 E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands	111
4.28.22 E.O. 11988, Flood Plain Management	
4.28.23 E.O. 12898, Environmental Justice	111
4.28.24 E.O. 13089, Coral Reef Protection	111
4.28.25 E.O. 13112, Invasive Species	111
5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS	113
6.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	115
6.1 Scoping and Draft SEIS	115
6.2 Agency Coordination	115
6.3 List Of Statement Recipients (Draft SEIS)	115
6.4 Comments Received and Response	115
6.5 Circulation of Final SEIS	116
7.0 REFERENCES	117
0.0 INDEV	100

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Coastal Zone Management Consistency

Appendix B Pertinent Correspondence

Appendix C Cumulative Impact Assessment Report

Appendix D EFH Assessment Report

Appendix E Mitigation Reef Plan and Monitoring Program

Appendix F Physical and Biological Monitoring Program

Appendix G Vessel Operations Plan

Appendix H Borrow Area Hardbottom Survey Report

Appendix I Lake Worth Inlet Management Study and Implementation Plan

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
· ·	Preferred Alternative	
Figure 1. 2	Profiles - Fill Template	6
Figure 1. 3	Location Map, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet	8
Figure 2. 1	"No-Action" - No Uniform Existing Hardbottom R-121 to R-123	18
Figure 2. 2	"No-Action" - Assumed Uniform Hardbottom R-121 to R-123	19
Figure 2. 3	Beach Fill Design with Structures	21
Figure 2. 4	Beach Fill Performance at Six Years	22
Figure 2. 5	Beach Fill Performance After Eight Years	23
Figure 2. 6	Seven Potential Offshore Borrow Areas	25
Figure 2. 7	Borrow Area III	27
Figure 2. 8	Borrow Area IV	28
Figure 2. 9	Increased Fill Area Design	34
Figure 2. 10	Reduced Fill Area Design	36
Figure 3. 1	Plan View - Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet	48
Figure 3. 2	Shallow Water Wave Data for Station 158 Adjacent to Palm Beach, FL	50
Figure 3. 3	The Floridian Plateau	51
Figure 3. 4	Lake Worth Inlet Sediment Budget Cells and Domain	52
Figure 3. 5	Mean High Water Line Change Rates (ft/yr)	59
Figure 3. 6	Volume Change Rates (cy/yr)	61
Figure 3. 7	Aerial Photograph South of Lake Worth Inlet (Reach 1) (March 2001)	64
Figure 3. 8	Aerial Photograph of Reach 2 at Palm Beach Country Club (March 2001	.)65
Figure 3. 9	The Narrow Beach Front Along Reach 2 at Palm Beach Country Club	
	(February 2002).	65
Figure 3. 10	Aerial Photograph of Reach 3 at Breakers Hotel (March 2001)	65
Figure 3. 11	The Mid-Town Region of Reach 4 (February 2002)	66

Figure 3. 12	Aerial Photograph of Reach 5 at Widener's Curve (March 2001)	.66
Figure 3. 13	Rock and Groins in Reach 6 (February 2001)	.67
Figure 3. 14	Exposed Anastasia Formation in Reach 7	.67
Figure 3. 15	Oblique Aerial Photograph of the Concave Shoreline in Reach 7 (1999)	.68
Figure 3. 16	Lake Worth Public Beach, Immediately South of Lake Worth Pier (Reach 8)	.69
Figure 3. 17	Exposed Seawall Near R-135 (Reach 8)	.69
Figure 3. 18	Typical Beach and Seawall Conditions Near R-143 Along Reaches 9 & 10	.69
Figure 3. 19	South Lake Worth Inlet (Reach 11)	.70
_	Example of Nearshore Hardbottom Habitat Captured from Towed Video Survey Near FDEP Monument R-91	.82
•	Close-Up Photograph of Nnearshore Algal Fouling Community Shown in Figure 3.20	.82
V	Example of Intermediate Depth Hardbottom Habitat Captured From Towed Video Survey Near FDEP Monument R-103. Habitat Dominated by Low to Medium Profile Gorgonians and Sponges	.83
-	Photograph of Offshore Hardbottom Habitat Near Breakers Reef. Note High Diversity and Adult Fish Populations	.84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. 1	Properties with Seawalls in Project Vicinity Expected to Benefit by Project .	Page
Table 1. 2	Recreational Use of Phipps Ocean Park (1993 and 1999)	3
Table 2. 1	Alternative 4 - Increased Fill Design Characteristics	33
Table 2. 2	Major Features and Direct and Indirect Impacts of the Proposed Action and	
	Other Alternatives	43
Table 3. 1	Predicted Peak Storm Surge (ft MSL)	49
Table 3. 2	Lake Worth Inlet Sediment Budget - 1974 to 1994 and 1994 to 2000	54
Table 3. 3	Inlet Sediment Sinks and Mechanical Transfer - 1974 to 1994	56
Table 3. 4	Inlet Sediment Sinks and Mechanical Transfer - 1994 to 2000	56
Table 3. 5	Palm Beach Island Reaches	58
Table 3. 6	Shoreline (MHWL) Change Rates From 1928-1974, 1974-1990, and	
	1990-2000	60
Table 3. 7	Volume Change Rates From 1974-1990 and 1990-1997	62
Table 3. 8	Volume Change Rates From 1929-1957, 1957-1979	63
Table 3. 9	Summary of Net Volume Change Rates	71
Table 3. 10	Summary of Historical Nourishment Volumes - Reaches 2-11	71
Table 3. 11	Summary of Historical Erosion Volumes	72
Table 3. 12	Native Beach and Borrow Areas Grain Size Characteristics	73
Table 3. 13	Provisional Classification of Nearshore Hardbottom Habitat on the Inner Sh	ıelf
	of Palm Beach County	81
Table 3. 14	Essential Fish Habitat Areas	85
	Summary of Past, Present, and Proposed Future Projects and Direct Hardbotto Impacts Within Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet Region	